

Minnesota TSP Quality Assurance Plan

The following is the NRCS in Minnesota policy and procedure for Private Sector TSP Quality Assurance

1. Selection

- Conservation Practices. TSPs' initial 1st two jobs for each individual practice will be automatically reviewed. Additionally, each TSP's jobs will be spot checked at least once in a three year period for each practice the TSP is working on. Reviews will be conducted after installation. The state level TSP coordinator will notify TSPs that their completed jobs are being reviewed.
- Management Plans. The 1st three nutrient, pest, and grazing plans and 1st forestry and prescribed burning management plans will be reviewed **to the greatest extent possible prior to implementation.** The State TSP coordinator will initially notify any TSP certified on TechReg of initial plan review requirements and plan reviewer locations and then remind TSPs to submit their plans for review. Subsequently at least one plan will be spot checked over a three year period. This review can occur after practice installation. The state level TSP coordinator will notify TSPs that their plans are being reviewed as part of practice installation review.

2. Review Process

The review will be performed by area level personnel with appropriate Technical Approval Authority (TAA) using standardized templates (example attached). A copy of the review will be submitted to the state level TSP coordinator. Plans and designs will be QA'd and spot-checked using standardized forms (Attached).

3. Transmittal of the Review

The state level coordinator will issue review results to the TSP's and maintain a database of all TSP jobs completed and QA reviews performed.

TSP ENGINEERING QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW

TSP:

Practice:

County:

Producer Name:

Date of Service:

| DESIGN | Maximum Score | | Actual Score |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| NRCS Policy Compliance | 5 | | |
| Documentation | 10 | | |
| Plans | 15 | | |
| Compliance with Standards | 20 | | |
| Certification Statement | 5 | | |
| Inspection Plan | 5 | | |
| O&M Plan | 5 | | |
| Cost Estimate | 5 | | |
| CHECKOUT | | | |
| Preconstruction Conference | 5 | | |
| Documentation | 10 | | |
| CERTIFICATION | | | |
| As-Built Drawings | 10 | | |
| Certification Statement | 5 | | |
| Total Possible | 100 | Actual Total | |

RATING SUMMARY

90-100 Excellent

80-90 Good

70-80 Acceptable

< 70 or any 10 point or greater item scored as 0 is unsatisfactory

Total score is 60. Rating is unsatisfactory because of point total <70 and a single 10+ point item is 0.

Note: Other than preliminary reviews provided by the NRCS at the request of the TSP, if items were submitted to the NRCS and were not accepted for payment because they were incomplete, rating will be based upon the original work submitted.

DESIGN

NRCS Policy Compliance

Requirements such as underground utility safety, etc which may not be utilized in non-NRCS projects, but are a requirement in the Statement of Work.

Score: Noncompliance = 0 Attempted compliance that does not meet policy = 3 Full Compliance = 5

Comment:

Documentation

Well documented, easy to follow including design assumptions. Documentation clearly shows that planning requirements are achieved (For 313, storage period from Manure Management Plan is met). Storage volume computations are present. Structural design computations are present and show loading conditions and design of structural elements. For standard designs, loading and foundation conditions are verified.

Score: No design documentation provided = 0 Documentation for major component such as storage volume or structural integrity not provided or is inadequate = 3

Documentation provided, but lacking adequate detail = 7 Documentation is complete = 10.

Comment:

Plans

Plans are complete and in sufficient detail so that the contractor can construct it to proper dimension, location, grade, and utilize proper materials and construction techniques. Elements expressly called for in the Statement of Work such as plan view, location of active or abandoned feedlots, etc. are included.

Score: Plans are inadequate, could not be constructed without continual direction = 0

Plans are lacking detail in critical areas, but contractor could construct with occasional direction = 5

Plans are lacking detail related to meeting NRCS standard, but engineering detail to properly construct are generally present = 10

Plans are adequate for construction and cover minimum NRCS requirements = 15

Comment:

Compliance with Standards

Major element(s) of standard not met. Landowner is required to revise project to correct deficiency = 0

Significant part of standard not met, but practice will meet the intended purpose.

Changes in O&M plan may be required = 10

Relatively minor element of standard not met = 15

Standards are met = 20

Comment:

Certification Statement

Proper certification statement included = 5

Statement not included = 0

Comment:

Inspection Plan

Inspection plan identifies inspection and testing requirements, including frequency, timing, key items, and qualifications of inspectors = 5

Inspection plan includes inspection requirements, but lacks required detail = 3

Inspection plan not adequate = 0

Comment:

O&M Plan

Plan includes information needed by operator to safely and efficiently operate and maintain the practice = 5

Plan lacks adequate detail = 3

Plan is inadequate or lacks critical safety information such as confined spaces warnings = 0

Comment:

Cost Estimate

Independent cost estimate prepared that is divided into logical pay items with unit prices and has items eligible for cost sharing broken out = 5

Cost estimate is present, but not detailed = 3

Cost estimate not adequate to assist producer with evaluating contractor proposals = 0

Comment:

CHECKOUT

Preconstruction conference

Notes from preconstruction conference are included = 5

Preconstruction conference held, but no notes present = 2

No preconstruction Conference = 0

Comment:

Documentation

Documentation present which verifies that the inspection plan was carried out.

Documentation includes inspection reports, test results, photos, etc = 10

Some documentation present, but does not confirm the inspection plan = 5

Documentation inadequate to verify quality of construction work = 0

Comment:

CERTIFICATION

As-built drawings

As built drawings are provided which clearly show changes from original plans, and document final dimensions, elevations, locations, etc. = 10

As-built drawings are provided, but missing key items = 5

As-built drawings are not adequate = 0

Comment:

Certification Statement

Certification statement present and uses proper wording = 5

Certification statement not present = 0

Comment:

TSP QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW for Nutrient Management¹

TSP:

Practice:

County:

Producer Name:

Date of Service:

| DESIGN (Plan) | Maximum Possible Score | Actual Score |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Documentation-Information | 10 | |
| Documentation-evaluations | 15 | |
| Plan Content | 20 | |
| Plan Format | 5 | |
| Plan Accuracy (Policy and Standards) | 15 | |
| Certification and Delivery | 10 | |
| Subtotal | 75 | |
| INSTALLATION (Implementation) | | |
| Pre-implementation conference | 10 | |
| Records | 5 | |
| Subtotal | 15 | |
| CERTIFICATION | | |
| Certification Statement | 10 | |
| Subtotal | 10 | |
| Total Possible | 100 | |

RATING SUMMARY

Maximum.

90-99% of maximum.

80-89% of maximum.

< 80% or ≥15 point item scored as 0.

No improvements needed

Minor improvements needed

Considerable improvements needed

Start over. Failure to improve may initiate de-certification

DESIGN (Plan)

Documentation-Information

Consult the Deliverables section of the 590 and 633 Statements of Work (SOW)s and the back of MN-ECS-15 (Nutrient Management Plan Quick Checklist) dtd.1/04.

0 points- No information is provided

5 points- Information is provided but is difficult to decipher

10 points- All requested information is provided in an easily understandable manner (NRCS forms or equivalent are used)

Documentation-Evaluations

Consult the Deliverables section of the 590 and 633 Statements of Work (SOW)s

0 points- No evaluations are provided or nutrient budgets are not provided.

5 points- Most evaluations provided but calculations are missing, incorrect or not substantiated by records

10-points- All evaluations are provided but calculations are missing, incorrect or not substantiated by records

15 points- All evaluations are provided, correct and supported by records

Comments:

Plan content

The front of MN-ECS-15 (Nutrient Management Plan Quick Checklist) and the Nutrient Management Statement of Work can be used to help score this element.

0 points- Most required elements are missing

5 points- Some required elements are missing

10 points- Most important element are present (planned practices and nutrient application rate, methods and timing). Minor discrepancies in sampling and analysis guidance.

15 points- All elements are present and accurate

20 points- Everything is perfect. NRCS deviations are not used.

Comments:

Plan format

0 points- Plan is difficult to interpret

3 points- Plan is understandable but not in NRCS format

5 points- Plan provided in NRCS format

Comments:

Plan accuracy

0 points- Nutrient recommendations exceed NRCS acceptable deviations of University of Minnesota Recommendations by 30 or more lbs./ac. and/or Sensitive area requirements mainly ignored.

5 points- Sensitive area guidance is incorrect and/or N & P recommendations exceed acceptable NRCS deviations guidance by 10-29 lbs./ac). K recommendations deviate by more than 30 lbs./ac.

10 points - N & P recommendations meet NRCS guidance. K recommendations deviate from NRCS guidance by 10-29 lbs./ac. Most sensitive area guidance is correct

15 points- N, P and K recommendations meet NRCS guidance. All sensitive area guidance is accurate.

Comments:

Certification and delivery

0 points- Plan not certified or delivered to producer in timely manner

5 points- Plan not certified but delivered to producer in timely manner

10 points- Plan certified and delivered in timely manner

Comments:

INSTALLATION (Plan Implementation)

Pre-Implementation Conference

0 points- No conference

5 points- Some required items are discussed with client

10 points- All required items are discussed with client

Comments:

Records

0 points- producer does not maintain records

5 points- records required by NRCS and as applicable EPA and MPCA are maintained

Comments:

CHECKOUT

See statement of work

0 points- TSP signature not included on required certification forms and/or information provided by TSP inadequate for NRCS to report progress

5 points- Signature included and information sufficient to report progress

Comments:

¹. Review of initial plans is conducted using only the Design (Plan) part of the scoring system. Subsequent spot-check reviews use the entire scoring system.

TSP QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW for Pest Management¹

TSP:

Practice:

County:

Producer Name:

Date of Service:

| DESIGN (Plan) | Maximum Possible Score | Actual Score |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Documentation-Information | 5 | |
| Documentation-evaluations | 15 | |
| Plan Content and accuracy | 30 | |
| Plan Format | 5 | |
| Certification and Delivery | 10 | |
| Subtotal | 75 | |
| INSTALLATION (Implementation) | | |
| Pre-implementation conference | 10 | |
| Records | 5 | |
| Subtotal | 15 | |
| CERTIFICATION | | |
| Certification Statement | 10 | |
| Subtotal | 10 | |
| Total Possible | 100 | |

RATING SUMMARY

Maximum.

90-99% of maximum.

80-89% of maximum.

< 80% or ≥ 15 point item scored as 0.

No improvements needed

Minor improvements needed

Considerable improvements needed

Start over. Failure to improve may initiate de-certification

DESIGN (Plan)

Documentation-Information

Consult the Deliverables section of the 595 Statement of Work (SOW)s

0 points- No information is provided

3 points- Information is provided but is difficult to decipher

5 points- All requested information is provided in an easily understandable manner (NRCS forms or equivalent are used)

Documentation-Evaluations

Consult the Deliverables section of the 595 Statement of Work (SOW)

0 points- No evaluations are provided.

5 points- Some but not all assessments and evaluations provided.

10-points-All assessments provided but minor errors occur or unsubstantiated by records.

15 points- All evaluations are provided, correct and supported by records

Comments:

Plan content and accuracy

The Pest Management Statement of Work can be used to help score this element.

0 points- Many required elements on the 595 statement of work are missing

5 points- Some elements are missing

15 points-All elements are present. Elements 2d. through 2h. are present; make sense and supported by documentation. Minor discrepancies in remaining elements

30 points- Everything is perfect.

Comments:

Plan format

0 points- Plan is difficult to interpret

3 points-Plan is understandable but not in NRCS format

5 points-Plan provided in NRCS format

Comments:

Certification and delivery

0 points- Plan not certified or delivered to producer in timely manner

5 points- Plan not certified but delivered to producer in timely manner

10 points-Plan certified and delivered in timely manner

Comments:

INSTALLATION (Plan Implementation)

Pre-Implementation Conference

0 points- No conference

5 points-Some required items are discussed with client

10 points- All required items are discussed with client

Comments:

Records

0 points-producer does not maintain records

5 points- records required by NRCS and as applicable EPA and MDA are maintained

Comments:

CHECKOUT

See statement of work

0 points- TSP signature not included on required certification forms and/or information provided by TSP inadequate for NRCS to report progress

5 points- Signature included and information sufficient to report progress

Comments:

Review of initial plans is conducted using only the Design (Plan) part of the scoring system. Subsequent spot-check reviews use the entire scoring system.

TSP QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW – Forestry¹

TSP:

Practice:

County:

Producer Name:

Date of Service:

| DESIGN | Maximum Score | | Actual Score |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| NRCS Policy Compliance | 10 | | |
| Documentation | 10 | | |
| Detailed Plans | 15 | | |
| Compliance with Standards | 15 | | |
| Certification Statement | 10 | | |
| O&M Plan | 5 | | |
| Cost Estimate | 5 | | |
| Subtotal | 70 | | |
| INSTALLATION | | | |
| Pre-installation Conference | 5 | | |
| Documentation | 10 | | |
| Subtotal | 15 | | |
| CHECKOUT | | | |
| Records | 5 | | |
| Certification Statement | 10 | | |
| Subtotal | 15 | | |
| Total Possible | 100 | Actual Total | |

RATING SUMMARY

Maximum.

90-99% of maximum.

80-89% of maximum.

< 80% or ≥15 point item scored as 0.

No improvements needed

Minor improvements needed

Considerable improvements needed

Start over. Failure to improve may initiate de-certification

Note: Other than preliminary reviews provided by the NRCS at the request of the TSP, if items were submitted to the NRCS and were not accepted for payment because they were incomplete, rating will be based upon the original work submitted.

DESIGN

NRCS Policy Compliance

Consult the deliverables section of the State of Work for each practice and applicable forms, if available, to meet the requirements of this item.

0 Points – No information/form is provided.

5 Points – Information provided unclear and submitted improperly (no form).

10 Points – All required/requested information is provided in a clear manner and documented properly on approved forms (if required/available).

Comment:

Documentation

The State of Work for each practice contains instructions for documenting the planned practice which may include wind erosion calculations, stocking density or spacing, species, etc.

0 Points – Documentation not is provided.

3 Points – Documentation is wrong or inadequate for the practice.

7 Points – Documentation is present but lacks adequate detail to verify.

10 Points - Documentation is complete and verifiable.

Comment:

Plans

Plans are complete and in sufficient detail so that the contractor can follow it to proper stocking, location, grade, and utilize proper materials and management techniques.

Elements expressly called for in the Statement of Work such as plan sketches, calculations and protective measures, etc. are included.

0 Points – Plans are poorly written and required elements are missing.

5 – 10 Points – Plans are lacking sufficient detail and some required elements are missing or wrong.

15 Points - Plans are complete, easy to follow and cover minimum NRCS requirements.

Comment:

Compliance with Standards

Standards are available on the NRCS EFOTC webpage. All practices must meet minimum practice standards at implementation.

0 Points - Major element(s) of standard not met. Landowner is required to revise project to correct deficiency.

5 Points - Significant part of standard not met, but practice will meet the intended purpose.

10 Points – The minimum requirements of the standard is met but changes in O&M plan may be required.

15 Points – All minimum required standard elements are met.

Comment:

Certification Statement

0 Points – Plan not certified or delivered to landowner in a timely manner.

5 Points – Plan not certified but delivered to landowner in a timely manner.

10 Points – A certified plan is delivered to the landowner in a timely manner.

Comment:

O&M Plan

0 Points - Plan is inadequate or lacks critical information to implement.

3 Points - Plan lacks adequate detail to implement.

5 Points - Plan includes information needed by landowner to safely and efficiently operate and maintain the practice.

Comment:

Cost Estimate

0 Points - Cost estimate not adequate to assist producer with evaluating contractor proposals = 0

3 Points - Cost estimate is present, but not detailed.

5 Points - Independent cost estimate prepared that is divided into logical pay items with unit prices and has items eligible for cost sharing detailed,

Comment:

Installation (Plan Implementation)

Pre-installation conference

0 Points - No pre-installation conference.

2 Points – Pre-installation conference held, but no notes present.

5 Points - Notes from pre-installation are included.

Comment:

Documentation

0 Points – Some or all of the required documentation for the practice is missing.

5 Points – Required documents are present but improperly completed.

10 Points – All required documentation is present and properly completed.

Comment:

CHECK OUT

Records

0 Points – Check out records are incomplete or missing.

5 Points – Check out records are complete and correct.

Certification Statement

0 Points - Certification statement not present.

5 Points – Certification statement submitted but inadequate.

10 Points - Certification statement present.

Comment:

¹. Review of initial plans is conducted using only the Design (Plan) part of the scoring system. Subsequent spot-check reviews use the entire scoring system.

TSP QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW for Prescribed Grazing¹

TSP:

Practice:

County:

Producer Name:

Date of Service:

| DESIGN (Plan) | Maximum Possible Score | Actual Score |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Documentation-Inventory | 10 | |
| Documentation-forage balance | 10 | |
| Plan Content | 25 | |
| Plan Format | 5 | |
| Plan Accuracy (Policy and Standards) | 15 | |
| Certification and Delivery | 10 | |
| Subtotal | 75 | |
| INSTALLATION (Implementation) | | |
| Pre-implementation conference | 10 | |
| Records | 5 | |
| Subtotal | 25 | |
| CERTIFICATION | | |
| Certification Statement | 10 | |
| Subtotal | 10 | |
| Total | 100 | |

RATING SUMMARY

Maximum.

90-99% of maximum.

80-89% of maximum.

< 80% or ≥15 point item scored as 0.

No improvements needed

Minor improvements needed

Considerable improvements needed

Start over. Failure to improve may initiate de-certification

DESIGN (Plan)

Documentation-Inventory

Documentation of initial site visit including details of livestock numbers and management, sensitive areas, existing fences and watering systems, forages on the site.

0 points- No information is provided

5 points- Information is provided but is difficult to decipher

10 points- All requested information is provided in an easily understandable manner (NRCS forms or equivalent are used)

Documentation-Forage Balance

NRCS ECS – 001 or equivalent completed.

0 points- No forage balance completed

10-points- Livestock and forage balance completed.

Plan content

Refer to the Statement of Work (SOW) for 528A, Prescribed Grazing

0 points- Most required elements are missing

5 points- Some required elements are missing

10 points- Most important elements are present (management of sensitive areas, forage and grazing management), but other elements missing

15 points- All elements are present, but lacks adequate detail to apply plan.

20 points- All elements addressed, but forage and grazing system management is not addressed or poorly addressed.

25 points- All elements of a grazing plan are addressed clearly and concisely.

Plan format

0 points- Plan is difficult to interpret

3 points- Plan is understandable but not in NRCS format

5 points- Plan provided in NRCS format

Plan accuracy

0 points- Number of paddocks, paddock size, and system management does not allow for adequate rest period for the forages or nutritional requirements of the livestock. Water requirements not adequately addressed. Sensitive areas management not addressed.

5 points- Number of paddocks, paddock size, and system management does allow for adequate rest period for the forages and for nutritional requirements of the livestock. Water requirements not adequately addressed. Sensitive areas management not addressed.

10 points - Number of paddocks, paddock size, and system management does allow for adequate rest period for the forages and for nutritional requirements of the livestock. Water requirements not adequately addressed. Most sensitive area management is adequate to protect the resource.

15 points- Number of paddocks, paddock size, and system management does allow for adequate rest period for the forages and for nutritional requirements of the livestock. Water requirements adequately addressed. Management of sensitive areas addressed adequately to protect the resource.

Certification and delivery

0 points- Plan not certified or delivered to producer in timely manner

5 points- Plan not certified but delivered to producer in timely manner

10 points- Plan certified and delivered in timely manner

INSTALLATION (Plan Implementation)

Pre-Implementation Conference

0 points- No conference

5 points- Some required items are discussed with client

10 points- All required items are discussed with client

Records

0 points-producer does not maintain records

5 points- records required by NRCS and as applicable EPA and MPCA are maintained

CHECKOUT

See statement of work

0 points- TSP signature not included on required certification forms and/or information provided by TSP inadequate for NRCS to report progress

5 points- Signature included and information sufficient to report progress

¹. Review of initial plans is conducted using only the Design (Plan) part of the scoring system. Subsequent spot-check reviews use the entire scoring system.